Case 1:15-cr-00445-PAE Document 104 Filed 12/28/15 Page 1 of 54

FCBLECHC UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 1 SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK 2 3 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, 4 15 CR 445 (PAE) V. 5 JONATHAN RODRIGUEZ, et al., 6 Defendants. -----x 7 8 New York, N.Y. December 11, 2015 9 10:03 a.m. 10 Before: 11 HON. PAUL A. ENGELMAYER, 12 District Judge 13 14 **APPEARANCES** 15 PREET BHARARA United States Attorney for the Southern District of New York 16 JAMES McDONALD 17 SAMSON ENZER DINA McLEOD 18 Assistant United States Attorneys GERALD DiCHIARA 19 Attorney for Defendant Andrew Echevarria 20 JAMES ROTH 21 Attorney for Defendant Marquis Wright 22 JOHN DIAZ Attorney for Defendant Jordan Rivera 23 KAFAHNI NKRUMAH 24 Attorney for Defendant Daquann McBeth 25 (Appearances continued on next page)

FCBLECHC

1	APPEARANCES (Cont'd)
2	JOHN BURKE Attorney for Defendant Raheem Amarizan
3	THOMAS DUNN Attorney for Defendant William Knox
5	GUY OKSENHENDLER Attorney for Defendant Miguel Romero
6 7	SCOTT TULMAN Attorney for Defendant Kaye Rosado
8	STEPHANIE CARVLIN Attorney for Defendant Naquann Simmons
9	JESSE SIEGEL
10 11	Attorney for Defendant Wilfredo Rivera IRA LONDON
12	Attorney for Defendant Vincent Fielder JOHN MERINGOLO
13	Attorney for Defendant Mia Dentico AARON GOLDSMITH
14 15	Attorney for Defendant Pamela Brown
16	
1718	
19	
20 21	
22	
23	
2425	

1 (Case called) MR. McDONALD: Good morning, your Honor. 2 3 McDonald, Samson Enzer, and Dina McLeod for the government. 4 THE COURT: Very good. 5 THE DEPUTY CLERK: Counselors for the defense, present 6 for Andrew Echevarria. 7 MR. DiCHIARA: Gerald DiChiara, and Mr. Echevarria is 8 seated in the second row. 9 THE COURT: Why don't I ask everyone to be seated and 10 when my deputy, Mr. Smallman, calls the name of the defendant, 11 please raise your hand so that I can acknowledge you. 12 And, counsel, when you appear on behalf of a 13 defendant, please stand up so I can see you. Good morning to you, Mr. DiChiara. 14 15 Where is Mr. Echevarria? Very good. Good morning to 16 you. 17 THE DEPUTY CLERK: Jonathan Rodriguez. 18 THE COURT: Where is Mr. Rodriguez? 19 MR. McDONALD: Your Honor, Mr. Rodriguez was arrested 20 in upstate New York and he's not yet been transferred down here 21 to the Southern District. 22 THE COURT: Very good. Thank you. 23 THE DEPUTY CLERK: Marquis Wright. 24 MR. ROTH: Good morning, your Honor. James Roth on

25

behalf of Mr. Wright.

1	THE COURT: Good morning to you, Mr. Roth, and good
2	morning to you, Mr. Wright.
3	THE DEPUTY CLERK: Wali Burgos.
4	MR. McDONALD: Your Honor, defendant Burgos is
5	currently in state custody and hasn't been transferred down to
6	federal custody just yet.
7	THE COURT: All right. Thank you.
8	THE DEPUTY CLERK: Jason Benjamin.
9	MR. McDONALD: Jason Benjamin was also arrested on
10	December 9 in the Northern District of New York and has not yet
11	been transferred down to Southern District.
12	THE COURT: Very good.
13	THE DEPUTY CLERK: Jordan Rivera.
14	MR. DIAZ: Good morning, your Honor. John Diaz
15	appearing for Mr. Rivera.
16	THE COURT: Good morning.
17	THE DEPUTY CLERK: William Amarizan.
18	MR. NKRUMAH: Good morning, your Honor. Kafahni
19	Nkrumah standing in for Ms. Susan Marcus and Mr. Amarizan.
20	THE COURT: Good morning.
21	Mr. Nkrumah, any idea why Ms. Marcus is not able to be
22	here today?
23	MR. NKRUMAH: No, your Honor. I know when we did the
24	presentment, she asked if I could stand in.

THE COURT: I understand. Given that the arrests in

this case were made two days ago and that the first conference 1 2 was today, I can understand that. I fully expect she'll be 3 able to be here at future conferences. Thank you. 4 THE DEPUTY CLERK: Raheem Amarizan. 5 MR. BURKE: Good morning, your Honor. For Mr. Amarizan, John Burke. 6 7 Judge, with the Court's permission, I have a sentence at 10:30, so Mr. Meringolo will cover for me if I have to leave 8 9 at 10:20. THE COURT: Very good. Good morning to you, 10 11 Mr. Amarizan. Good morning to you, Mr. Burke. And thank you 12 for bringing that to my attention. Of course, that's fine. 13 THE DEPUTY CLERK: Tjon Macoll. 14 MS. CARVLIN: Yes, good morning, your Honor. 15 Stephanie Carvlin. I am appearing on behalf of Michael Sporn, your Honor, for Mr. Macoll. Mr. Sporn had a preexisting court 16 17 appearance for today. THE COURT: Very good. Mr. Macoll, who are you? Good 18 19 morning to you. 20 Ms. Carvlin, thank you for covering today. 21

THE DEPUTY CLERK: Corey Heyward.

MR. McDONALD: Your Honor, Corey Heyward is one of three defendants in this indictment who have not yet been apprehended.

> THE COURT: Thank you.

22

23

24

25

THE DEPUTY CLERK: Jonathan Harris. 1 MR. McDONALD: I should have said, your Honor, that 2 3 Corey Heyward was one of five defendants who have not yet been apprehended. There are two who we have been informed will be 4 5 self-surrendering this morning. Jonathan Harris is one of 6 them. 7 THE DEPUTY CLERK: William Knox. MR. DUNN: For William Knox, Thomas Dunn. Good 8 9 morning, your Honor. 10 THE COURT: And where is Mr. Knox? 11 MR. DUNN: He's standing up. 12 THE COURT: Good morning, Mr. Knox. Good morning, 13 Mr. Dunn. 14 THE DEPUTY CLERK: Corey Cooks. 15 MR. McDONALD: Corey Cooks, your Honor, is the second defendant who we anticipate to self-surrender this morning. 16 17 THE DEPUTY CLERK: Daguann McBeth. MR. NKRUMAH: Good morning, your Honor. Mr. Nkrumah 18 for Mr. McBeth, who's standing. 19 20 THE COURT: Good morning, Mr. McBeth. Thank you. 21 Good morning, Mr. Nkrumah. 22 THE DEPUTY CLERK: Jahnomi Benjamin. 23 MR. McDONALD: Defendant Benjamin is currently in 24 state custody, your Honor, and has not yet been writted down to

25

federal custody.

THE DEPUTY CLERK: Keith Ruiz. 1 MR. McDONALD: Keith Ruiz is currently in federal 2 3 custody in Florida, your Honor, and has not yet been transferred to the Southern District. 4 5 THE COURT: Thank you. 6 THE DEPUTY CLERK: Ryan Valentin. 7 MR. McDONALD: Ryan Valentin, your Honor, is one of 8 the three remaining defendants who have not yet been 9 apprehended, assuming that the two that we believe will be 10 self-surrendering this morning do in fact self-surrender. 11 THE DEPUTY CLERK: Miquel Romero. 12 MR. OKSENHENDLER: Good morning, your Honor. I'm Guy 13 Oksenhendler for Mr. Romero. 14 THE COURT: Good morning, Mr. Romero. Good morning to 15 you, Mr. Oksenhendler. 16 THE DEPUTY CLERK: Kaye Rosado. 17 THE COURT: All right. Good morning to you, Mr. Rosado. 18 MR. DUNN: Your Honor, I'll stand up for Scott Tulman, 19 20 who's the attorney. I'll stand up for purposes of the 21 conference. 22 THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Dunn, for standing in for 23 Mr. Tulman. He in fact notified our chambers that he was 24 running late this morning.

THE DEPUTY CLERK: Naquann Simmons.

25

1	MS. CARVLIN: Good morning again, your Honor.
2	Stephanie Carvlin for Naquann Simmons.
3	THE COURT: Good morning.
4	THE DEPUTY CLERK: Diquinn Lacend.
5	MR. McDONALD: Your Honor, Diquinn Lacend is currently
6	in state custody and has not yet been transferred to federal
7	custody.
8	THE COURT: Thank you.
9	THE DEPUTY CLERK: Wilfredo Rivera.
10	MR. SIEGEL: Good morning, Judge. Jesse Siegel for
11	Mr. Rivera.
12	THE COURT: Good morning.
13	THE DEPUTY CLERK: Kenneth Jenkins.
14	MR. McDONALD: Kenneth Jenkins, your Honor, is the
15	final defendant who has not yet been apprehended.
16	THE COURT: Thank you.
17	THE DEPUTY CLERK: Vincent Fielder.
18	MR. LONDON: Ira London for Vincent Fielder.
19	THE COURT: Good morning, Mr. London. Good morning to
20	you, Mr. Fielder.
21	THE DEPUTY CLERK: Mia Dentico.
22	MR. MERINGOLO: Good morning, your Honor. John
23	Meringolo for Ms. Dentico.
24	THE COURT: Good morning.
25	THE DEPUTY CLERK: Pamela Brown.

MR. GOLDSMITH: Good morning, your Honor. Aaron Goldsmith on behalf of Ms. Brown.

THE COURT: Good morning, Mr. Goldsmith. Good morning to you, Ms. Brown.

With respect to the defendants who have not yet appeared, I have no choice today but to set an overall global schedule which will bind them. That said, I'm interested in making had sure that they and their counsel get before me as soon as possible. Therefore, I will ask the government to contact my chambers as individual defendants are apprehended or brought into the district, as the case may be. Ideally, we can come up with a date next weak to capture as many of those people in one conference as possible so as not to have a need for too many one-off conferences. But I'll ask the government to be proactive in keeping me abreast of the state of play with respect to those defendants.

MR. McDONALD: Of course, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. I have a number of housekeeping matters. To begin with, I want to acknowledge, to the extent there are people in the overflow room, I want to welcome you. Not knowing how many friends or family would be here today, we arranged for an overflow room in Courtroom 506 so that friends or family would be able to listen. It may be that that's unnecessary. There appears to be extra space here. But to the extent there are people in Room 506, I want to

welcome you.

Counsel, I understand from my deputy that no defense lawyers have indicated there's a need for interpreters. Is that correct?

MR. ROTH: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you. I want to also just take a moment and thank our marshals and court security officers.

Obviously, in a case of this scale, there's a lot of planning that goes into organizing a conference like this and keeping everything orderly and safe. And so I want to thank everyone for their efforts in organizing today. Thank you.

With respect to that, the marshals and court security officers advised my chambers that given the sheer number of defendants, there would be a need for restraints to be put on the defendants today given the sheer number of people.

Obviously, that's not an ideal situation, but I hope everyone understands that it is inherent in the number of people put together in the jury box. As the case moves forward, we'll be attentive to figuring out if there are ways to avoid that in the future. I just want everyone to know I'm sensitive to the situation. All right.

With respect then to today, here's what I'm going to do. I want to give you, first of all, an overview of the ground I intend to cover and then we'll go through each of the individual items.

To begin with, I'll be calling shortly on government to give me reports on a number of fronts. These were largely the ones that were covered in the order that I issued yesterday, but they include a description of the scope and nature and charges in the case, a description of the nature of discovery in the case. I want a report on the types of searches and seizures and postarrest statements that may have occurred in the case so that we can all get an early read out on areas of potential suppression motions. And I'm interested really in getting the government's view on the trajectory of the case going forward, including the possibility of superseding indictments and the like.

After we go through all those topics, I'm going to open the floor to defense counsel to raise any and all issues. One of the issues that's foremost on my mind is to set a rational next conference date in the case, and I'll be interested in counsel's views on the subject.

For everyone's benefit, although I'm obviously open to hearing contrary views, my initial view, which is informed in part by having handled a 76-defendant gang case that spanned the last several years, is that in a case of this scale, it's better to go step by step. It's ill advised to commit at a first conference to a long term schedule, including a trial date and things of that nature. I'm very much mindful that the scope of charges may change, the number of defendants may

change and expand. There may be superseding indictments.

And so it seems to me rational instead at an initial conference like this to start the process of educating all of us as to what this case is about and to set a next conference date that's far enough into the future that defense counsel are up to speed as to what the case looks like and so that we all when we come together again will have a better sense of the challenges presented by this case.

And so subject to what I hear from counsel today, my expectation is that at the end of this conference, I'm going to set a next conference date probably a couple of months from now. And my expectation is that at that conference we would be taking up, among other things, perhaps a deadline for a superseding indictment, a timetable for addressing suppression motions, and possibly a trial date or dates. Again, I'm open to hearing contrary views. But borne of the experience in a much larger gang case, that seems to me the rational way to go here.

I want to say a word or two looking far down the road about the prospect of a trial in this case. I want to underscore in particular something I wrote in the order that I issued yesterday. There are some 26 or so defendants named in the indictment and something short of 20, but not far short, defendants present here today. I have and I suspect no one here has any way to project how many of these defendants will

one day go to trial, if any. But so that all counsel know, it is my policy not hold any single trial involving more than approximately five defendants.

In my judgment and experience, a trial on that scale simply is unfair to the defendants. It's impossible for a jury or hard for a jury to keep the defendants and the individual charges straight. And so as a matter of ensuring fairness to the defendants in the event down the road we get to a point where there are more than approximately five defendants going to trial, it's my expectation that we would have multiple trials to avoid that problem.

All of this is obviously for far down the road. It's going to become much clearer over time which defendants are likely to go to trial and which of those defendants are properly and fairly tried together. But I wanted to put down a marker and a reassurance at this point about that. When the case has taken more shape and counsel can better advise me in the event that numerous defendants appear to be headed towards trial, we can take up the issue of what the right group or groups are.

As a final preface before I call on the government, I want to say a word about issues that are specific to individual defendants. I fully expect there are going to be some such issues. They may involve matters of bail. They may involve matters of representation. This many defendant conference is

not the forum at which to resolve those issues.

With respect to bail, here is how I'd like to proceed. In the event that either party wants to appeal an adverse bail determination, please get a determination from the magistrate judge, in other words, fully litigated in front of the magistrate judge. If you are dissatisfied and you want to appeal the outcome, call my chambers and schedule a conference with my deputy, Mr. Smallman. Make sure that in advance of the conference I have the pretrial services report and the transcript of the hearing before the magistrate judge so that I can familiarize myself with it before the bail appeal conference.

For everyone's benefit, two such appeals were heard yesterday involving defendants Dentico and Brown. And following this conference, after we take a brief break, I will be continuing that conference today. I left the issue there unresolved at the end of yesterday's conference.

Relatedly, in my experience, there may be issues relating to representations, individual representations. I've already received a letter from Mr. Dunn relating to his client, Mr. Knox, indicating there may be an issue in connection with that representation. I'm happy to have an individual conference scheduled to take that up, but I'm not going to do it in front of the whole group.

MR. DUNN: Your Honor, at this point it's in abeyance

or withdrawn. 1 THE COURT: Very good. You'll let me know if you 2 3 believe or your client believes a conference of that nature is 4 necessary and I'll be happy to schedule one. Okay? Thank you, your Honor. 5 MR. DUNN: 6 THE COURT: But thank you for your letter. 7 appreciated it. With that and with that lengthy preface, let me call 8 9 on the government. I want to take this step by step. 10 I take it, Mr. McDonald, you'll be the primary 11 spokesman today? 12 MR. McDONALD: Yes, your Honor. 13 THE COURT: Tell us about the case. I'm interested in 14 understanding the overall charges. 15 MR. McDONALD: Sure, your Honor. The superseding indictment in this case charges 26 16 17 defendants in six counts. Count One is a racketeering conspiracy which charges 18 all 26 defendants with the racketeering conspiracy. 19 20 Count Two is murder in aid of racketeering. 21 Count Three is assault with a deadly weapon and 22 attempted murder in aid of racketeering. 23 Count Four is another assault and attempted murder in

Count Five charges a narcotics conspiracy.

24

25

aid of racketeering charge.

And Count Six charges using and carrying and possessing a firearm during and in relation to the racketeering conspiracy, which was discharged.

The charges in this case arise out of a federal investigation that is included in an investigation by this U.S. Attorney's Office, the ATF, the DEA, and the New York City Police Department. That investigation has been ongoing for more than a year, and there was an ongoing New York City Police Department investigation into the activities of the enterprise which is known as 18 Park even before then.

THE COURT: What does 18 Park refer to?

MR. McDONALD: 18 Park is a violent street gang, your Honor, and the name was derived from the fact that many of the members of 18 Park attended the same elementary school in the area which is known as PS 18 and there's a park right outside it. And so the individuals who lived in the area went to elementary school together in the area and really what began as a relationship between individuals who went to school together matured into a relationship that involved a gang, violent activity, and narcotics trafficking.

There are various points in time when the gang was known by other names. Initially they were known as Young Money and there were a few other names before they ultimately settled on the name 18 Park. The gang has a handshake. There are signs. The gang has a hierarchy. The older members of the

gang lead the gang. They can direct the activities of the younger members. They resolve disputes among the younger members, and they set rules or give advice.

For example, typically when the members and associates of the gangs conduct shootings, 13 of which are specified as overt acts in this indictment, the older members have told the younger members, when you're going to commit a shooting, go in groups. Three is ideal, two is better than one. And when you do these shootings, one person is the shooter. That person carries the gun and commits the shooting. One person serves as a lookout. The third person should serve to hold the door to one of the Patterson House buildings. That's because these doors often lock.

And what you see in a lot of these shootings is you see the members of 18 Park going into an area -- just to use one example, the October 2, 2014 shooting. That's an attempted murder of Daymar Morales, which is charged in Count Three of the indictment. That involved defendant Wali Burgos, defendant Jordan Rivera, defendant Corey Cooks, and a co-conspirator who is not named in the indictment.

During that shooting there's video surveillance that shows Wali Burgos, Jordan Rivera, and Corey Cooks meeting in the Patterson House building. They're gathering there. Then you see them from a different angle looking out the back window of the back door. They see the leader of the rival gang walk

through the courtyard. You see defendant Corey Cooks open the door and he holds the door while defendant Wali Burgos steps outside and fires a number of shots at the leader of the rival gang. The shots didn't hit the rival gang — this is all shown on video surveillance — but it hit his hat and it knocked the baseball cap he was wearing off his head. The member of the rival gang ducked down, runs into the other building.

I'll talk about the scope of discovery here in just a few minutes and what the discovery will entail, but that same day, October 2, 2014, defendant Burgos sent a Facebook message to this member of the rival gang and the Facebook message said "almost."

leaders who direct the activity of the younger members of the gang. They give them direction as to how to carry out their violent acts. They also give them direction as to how to carry out narcotics activity. The older members of the gang typically supply the drugs to the younger members. The older members and the leaders of the gang are typically not the ones who are out there doing the hand-to-hand sales, but they go get the drugs. They bring them to various stash houses.

For a long period of time, that stash house was the residence of defendant Mia Dentico. Later, the stash house became an apartment that was the residence of another coconspirator of the gang who is not named in this indictment.

Over time, the operation of the gang expanded.

Initially it was focused primarily in the Patterson Houses.

That's still the central focus of the gang. That's still where most of the violent activity occurs. And within the Patterson Houses, 18 Park occupies the north side. East 143rd Street serves at the dividing line between 18 Park on the north side of the Patterson Houses and a rival gang that occupies the territory on the south side of Patterson Houses. That territory, each gang views it as its own turf. It's that gang's territory in which it sells narcotics and which it protects with violent activities and it seeks to expand or seeks to encroach upon the other gang's territory.

THE COURT: I may be getting ahead of you here, but at least I noted that a substantial multidefendant case was brought apparently around the same time involving a gang called the Young Gunnaz. Is that the rival gang you're referring to?

 $$\operatorname{MR.}$ McDONALD: That actually is not the rival gang I'm referring to, your Honor.

There were three gangs operating in the area, two of which are subject to indictments that were unsealed on Wednesday. The Young Gunnaz is the gang I was just about to turn to. They operate primarily in the Mott Haven Houses development, and that's a hosing development that borders the Patterson Houses. It's very near the Patterson Houses, but it's not based within the Patterson Houses.

The other rival gang that I referred to earlier is subject to an ongoing federal investigation.

THE COURT: Is there any relationship between this case and the indictment in the Young Gunnaz case?

MR. McDONALD: There is, your Honor. They are also rival gangs. For a substantial period of time, the Young Gunnaz were affiliates of the rival gang that I referred to on the south side of the Patterson Houses. The Young Gunnaz was a more mature, larger organization. It had access to more firearms and was a more violent gang and so they came in and protected the younger --

THE COURT: I take it there are no defendants in common to the two cases.

MR. McDONALD: There are no defendants in common to the two cases, though there is substantial overlap in evidence.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. All right. That's very helpful. Thank you.

Let me just ask you to the extent that you can say, let me begin with this. I noted that there is a murder that is charged in the indictment of Johnny Moore, May 29, 2011, and the defendant Keith Ruiz is named in that. Is that murder subject to potential capital review?

MR. McDONALD: That is, your Honor. Our office has submitted an extenuating circumstances memorandum to Washington, D.C., and we will keep them apprised. But it is

subject to capital review, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you.

To the extent you can say, is there anything you can tell me at this stage vis-a-vis the potential for superseders?

MR. McDONALD: Yes, your Honor. This indictment goes into great detail as to a number of the violent acts that this gang is responsible for, but this is not all the violent acts. We're continuing to investigate. We're continuing to investigate the May 29, 2011 murder of Johnny Moore. It's correct defendant Keith Ruiz is charged with that murder. There is a possibility that other defendants, including other defendants named this indictment, would be charged with that murder.

The office is currently investigating other murders that we believe that members of 18 Park are responsible for. And the office is continuing to investigate other violent acts, including some of the other violent acts that are listed in the overt act portion of the indictment that could result in other substantive charges of violent acts in aid of racketeering along the lines of Counts Three and Four of this indictment.

So to answer your Honor's question, there is a possibility that there would be a superseding indictment, though we're prepared to proceed on this indictment.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you. Very helpful.

All right. Continuing on the list of topics that I

indicated to you in my order yesterday I'd be asking you about, can you give an overview of the Rule 16 discovery with a particular focus on what has been produced, if anything, what remains to be produced, and what the timetable is likely to be.

MR. McDONALD: Yes, your Honor. There are a number of different categories of discovery and I'll run through them one at a time for the Court.

The first category are Title III wiretap intercepts. With respect to those, the government is prepared to produce the applications, the orders, the calls themselves, the draft line sheets and transcripts subject to a draft transcript stipulation signed by each of the defense counsel.

And to give the Court an overview of the extent of that wiretap material, there was a 2015 Southern District of New York wiretap. That was a roving wiretap and that was a wiretap of the various and changing cell phones that were utilized by defendant Marquis Wright. Over the period of time, there was a three-month period of time, so there were three separate wiretap orders on defendant Wright's phones. During the roving interception period, he used at least 11 different cellular telephones.

He was arrested on a state marijuana charge and he had seven cellular phones at that time.

THE COURT: When was he arrested?

MR. McDONALD: Your Honor, I don't have the exact date

in front of me, but it was in the fall of 2015.

THE COURT: And he had seven phones on his person?

MR. McDONALD: Seven phones on his person.

The government, pursuant to the roving wiretap orders, intercepted communications from six different phones used by defendant Wright. There are approximately 10,000 calls that were intercepted, and those interceptions covered the time period from August of 2015 to the date of the arrest, December 9, 2015.

THE COURT: And of the 10,000 calls intercepted, is there any way of giving me a rough estimate of how many appear potentially relevant here?

MR. McDONALD: I don't have a specific number, your Honor, but I would say it's a large percentage of them.

And just to give your Honor a little bit of context, defendant Wright also maintained one cell phone that was a clean cell phone. On some of these intercepted communications, one that I'm thinking of in particular, defendant William Amarizan calls defendant Marquis Wright and says is this your dirty cell phone. He says yes, go ahead. And then they proceed to discuss narcotics distribution activity.

THE COURT: Which is I take it your way of saying that of the 10,000 calls, it's reasonable to assume not that many are going to be, from your perspective, clean calls, that these are phones to which are allocated calls in furtherance of the

gang.

MR. McDONALD: Correct, your Honor. That was the purpose of these cell phones. They were dropped on a regular basis.

THE COURT: All right. So from a planning perspective what it means is that defense counsel who received the discovery here, potentially they're going to be going through a great number of potentially relevant calls.

MR. McDONALD: That's correct, your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. How useful will the line sheets be? What I'm trying to do is make an early gauge of how much work there will be and what shortcuts or road maps there will be for the defense to take the measure of the case.

MR. McDONALD: Your Honor, the line sheets will be useful for the Southern District of New York intercepts.

There's a second category of intercepts which I'll -- just to stay with the Southern District intercepts, those are full line sheets. They're draft transcriptions, but they're draft transcriptions of the full conversations. They're the traditional line sheets that defense counsel will have seen that list the phone numbers, the time of the call, the duration of the call, and the content to the best of the transcriber's ability.

THE COURT: And I take it the stipulation you have in mind is one that makes it clear that the government is not

bound by any of the rough or draft transcripts that were created for investigative purposes.

MR. McDONALD: That's exactly right, your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. Go ahead.

MR. McDONALD: There is a second category of Title III intercepts and these are Title III intercepts that were conducted pursuant to an order of interception or to four separate orders of interception issued by the Northern District of New York. Two of those orders related to a cellular telephone utilized by an individual who is not named in this indictment, but there were relevant communications intercepted.

THE COURT: Including with defendants here?

MR. McDONALD: Including with defendants here, yes, on that intercept. A much smaller percentage of those intercepts would be relevant to this case, but there are some, and we're prepared to produce everything.

THE COURT: And is there some way in which to guide defense counsel, you'll be able to steer them to calls that are of more likely relevance to this case?

MR. McDONALD: We will, your Honor.

So there were two orders of interception issued by the Northern District of New York as to a target who is not named in this indictment but as to whom a number of the defendants appear on the intercepted communications. There were also two orders of interception issued in the Northern District of New

York that intercepted communications from two different cellular telephones used by Jonathan Rodriguez, who is the defendant listed first in this indictment.

THE COURT: Right.

MR. McDONALD: These interceptions occurred --

THE COURT: Is there a reason he's listed first? Is he denoted as a leader of the gang?

MR. McDONALD: He is denoted as a leader of the gang, your Honor.

These intercepted communications occurred from April of 2015 to June of 2015. As to those, just like as to the Southern District of New York intercepted communications, we'll produce the applications, the orders, the calls, and the draft transcriptions. Those draft transcriptions are not the traditional line sheets like we have here in the Southern District of New York. They're draft summaries. We don't have all the audio calls in our possession right now, but we expect to get them. I was informed yesterday that we expect to get them by the end of the day today.

THE COURT: And anything you can tell me about scale with respect to the four Northern District cell phones, including the two relating to Rodriguez?

MR. McDONALD: I don't have an exact number, your Honor, but it's in the thousands. I don't think it's more than 10,000, but I think it's of a similar volume to the Southern

District of New York.

THE COURT: As to the Rodriguez calls, is it your expectation that those two are overwhelmingly potentially relevant here as opposed to extraneous?

MR. McDONALD: They are overwhelmingly potentially relevant. Rodriguez had more clean conversations, but those weren't intercepted because they were nonpertinent.

In terms of the intercepted communications, yes,
Rodriguez went to Massena, New York, in large part to further
and to expand 18 Park's narcotics distribution activity and to
move it up to Massena, New York, or expand it to Massena, New
York, where the narcotics could be sold for higher prices. He
also, it's revealed from the intercepted communications, moved
to Massena, New York, because he was aware of this federal
investigation and he was hoping to evade law enforcement. But
one of the purposes of moving to upstate New York was to expand
18 Park's drug trafficking there.

A number of the defendants here are implicated in that drug trafficking activity, including arrests in Massena, New York, communications with Jonathan Rodriguez, and seizures of narcotics when they were being transported up to him in Massena, New York.

THE COURT: Okay. So just to recap as to the Title IIIs, you'll be producing all the underlying applications for all of these Title IIIs.

1 MR. McDONALD: Yes, your Honor. THE COURT: And you'll be producing ultimately the 2 3 line sheets or their equivalent, as well as the actual audio 4 intercepts. 5 MR. McDONALD: Yes, your Honor. And when we're 6 through the different categories, the government has a proposed 7 schedule. We expect to be able to do that in the next 30 days. THE COURT: Let's go through the other categories and 8 9 then you can give me the schedule. Thank you. 10 MR. McDONALD: There were approximately 50 undercover purchases of narcotics from approximately ten members and 11 associates of 18 Park who are named in this indictment. In 12 13 many cases, there is audio and/or video of the purchases. 14 every case, there's a lab report of the purchase and there are 15 the accompanying law enforcement documents. 16 THE COURT: What types of narcotics? 17 MR. McDONALD: It was crack cocaine and marijuana. And a smaller number of times it was heroin, but it was 18 19 primarily crack cocaine and marijuana in the undercover buys. 20 Your Honor, there is footage from two different pole 21 cameras, one of which was located at 331 East 146th Street, 22 which is just outside one of the primary stash houses. 23 THE COURT: Is that near 18 Park itself? 24 MR. McDONALD: It is, your Honor.

THE COURT: How long was the pole camera up?

25

MR. McDONALD: The pole camera was up from October of 2014 to the date of the arrest, December 9, 2015.

THE COURT: Both pole cameras?

MR. McDONALD: That's just one pole camera.

There's a second pole camera that was set up in the vicinity of 1114 White Plains Road, which is the location of the apartment where defendant Marquis Wright resides. That pole camera was up from August of 2015 to the date of the arrest, December 9, 2015.

There is also surveillance video and photographs of the defendants that were taken during the course of this investigation.

The way the surveillance works in the Patterson

Houses, there are New York City Housing Authority cameras that

are constantly running. They're retained for a short period of

time. And when we request particular footage, they will

download the footage and give it to us. So we have that

footage as it relates to a number of the violent incidents that

are listed in the indictment, as well as a number of other

incidents that are relevant to the investigation.

There was a live video feed that was set up in the New York City Housing Authority, the Patterson Houses building, 331 East 146th Street, just outside the apartment in that building which was used as one of the primary stash houses.

THE COURT: This video feed was set up for

investigative purposes?

MR. McDONALD: It was set up for investigative purposes.

(Pause)

MR. McDONALD: Your Honor, that camera was set up for security purposes, though the management of the building gave access --

THE COURT: Thank you.

MR. McDONALD: -- to law enforcement.

Also, your Honor, there were a number of search warrants that had been executed.

To begin, there were two search warrants that were executed in connection with the arrests in this case. One search warrant was executed on the same 1114 White Plains Road address that I mentioned earlier, the residence of defendant Marquis Wright. That search warrant uncovered three cell phones; approximately 14 grams of crack cocaine that was laid out on a cookie sheet drying — it had just been cooked in the kitchen — above the kitchen cabinets; approximately 50 grams of powder cocaine; approximately 72 grams of marijuana; about \$3,000 of cash.

There were a number of other search warrants. I guess one more that was executed on December 9. That was the search warrant that was executed at 331 East 146th Street. Narcotics paraphernalia was discovered there.

There were several other search warrants. There was a search warrant that was executed June 11, 2015, on the residence of defendant Andrew Echevarria. Crack cocaine, a firearm, and ammunition were recovered.

There was a search warrant that was executed on December 12, 2013 on the residence of Mia Dentico, which was at the time 18 Park's primary stash house. There were 130 grams of crack cocaine; a number of other quantities and types of narcotics; a number of different types of live rounds of ammunition; large amount of cash; and nine other, in addition to defendant Dentico who was present, nine other defendants named in the indictment were present during the execution of that search warrant.

MR. DUNN: Your Honor, I'm sorry to interrupt. I have to be up in the Bronx at 11:30. Mr. Siegel will cover the rest if that's okay with your Honor.

THE COURT: It is. I thank you.

MR. DUNN: Thank you.

MR. McDONALD: There were a number of other search warrants, your Honor, on various cellular telephones that were seized in connection with arrests of a number of the different defendants. Those search warrants were conducted pursuant to delayed notice provisions.

THE COURT: Sorry. The arrests though, are these the arrests that took place this week or earlier?

MR. McDONALD: No, your Honor. Those are prior state arrests.

THE COURT: But those searches are pursuant to warrant?

MR. McDONALD: They're pursuant to a federal warrant, your Honor. The federal warrant had a delayed notice provision. These were sneak and peek search warrants so as not to alert the defendants to the federal investigation or at least to the scope of the federal investigation or the particular targets.

One of those search warrants was executed on a cellular telephone that was seized from defendant Jordan Rivera in connection with one of his state arrests. Among other things, on that cellular telephone is a video that Jordan Rivera took of himself. It appears from the context of the video that he is planning to send it to a female with whom he's associated. And in that video he says, and I'm quoting from the video, it was for the family. I had to shoot that -- I'll paraphrase a little bit.

THE COURT: I had to shoot a person, not shoot a video?

MR. McDONALD: Your Honor, to quote it: I had to shoot that nigga. That nigga jumped my brother. I ain't going to lie. I'm going to kill one of those niggas. I just want you to hold me down while I'm in jail. The feds, fuck the

feds. I don't give a fuck about the feds. Suck my dick motherfucker.

I apologize for the language, your Honor. There's a number of other evidence of that variety that was seized from the cellular telephones that were searched pursuant to a federal search warrant subject to a sneak and peek provision.

THE COURT: Were other phones seized incident to the arrests this week?

MR. McDONALD: There were a number of other phones incident to the arrests this week. The government has not obtained search warrants for those. We expect that we will. That's an example, your Honor, of the type of thing we expect to produce in the second category of discovery when we get to the various phases. The government's proposal is there be a Phase 1, which would be the first 30-day period; Phase 2, which would be the second.

THE COURT: Let's round out the discovery and then talk about the phases.

MR. McDONALD: So that in large part covers the search warrants that would potentially be at issue in this case.

THE COURT: What other discovery is there in the case?

MR. McDONALD: There are a number of prison calls and emails, your Honor, from both federal and state facilities, with respect to a number of the different defendants.

In another category there are the associated law

enforcement materials or the law enforcement materials that are associated with the numerous violent acts that are under investigation, many of which are listed in the indictment.

THE COURT: When you say law enforcement materials, I think I have some sense of this from the prior case I mentioned, but what are you referring to specifically?

MR. McDONALD: Complaint reports, arrest reports. To the extent that they are Rule 16 discovery and not Rule 3500, the material that's in the state case file. Most of these incidents were initially investigated by the state. There was New York City Police Department paperwork, again, complaint reports, arrest reports, booking information.

THE COURT: In other words, you've already taken the trouble to go get those files so that to the extent there are records of, hypothetically, fingerprints or bullet fragments, you've got that stuff or you've tried to.

MR. McDONALD: That's correct, your Honor.

It also includes the full criminal history and arrest reports for each of the defendants. We have unsealed those as to each of the defendants. We're currently in possession of the arrest report for every one of the prior arrests of every one of these defendants. It's possible there are a few youthful offender arrests that we're not aware of, but I do believe that we're aware of every one of their prior arrests and that we have all of the records.

THE COURT: Okay. Good. Does this cover the species of discovery or is there more?

MR. McDONALD: There's a little bit more, your Honor.

THE COURT: Go ahead.

MR. McDONALD: The defendants have communicated about gang activity over social media and in particular over Facebook. I mentioned just one example, the message that defendant Wali Burgos sent to the rival gang leader after the attempted murder saying "almost." The government has obtained a Facebook search warrant and we have the returns of that Facebook search warrant. Those returns are voluminous. They are tens of thousands of PDF pages.

THE COURT: How many defendants have Facebook accounts that you've gotten?

MR. McDONALD: Your Honor, I don't have the number in front of me, but it's the vast majority. In fact, I think every one of the defendants had a Facebook account. I'm not certain about that, but it's close to that, if not all of them.

The final category, your Honor, is just individual discovery with respect to each defendant. This would be the pedigree information that was taken upon this arrest, the photos of tattoos, I mentioned criminal history and arrest reports that we had unsealed, any statement made to law enforcement either in connection with these arrests or in prior related matters.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Now, I am not aware right now of any statements to law enforcement that were made during the December 9.

THE COURT: That's getting to search/seizure issues. All right.

In terms of Rule 16 discovery, you mentioned several times a discovery plan. Tell me about it.

MR. McDONALD: Your Honor, the government proposes that discovery proceed in two phases. Phase 1 would take place over the next 30-day period. We expect to have Phase 1 completed within 30 days, and the material that I'm about to mention would be produced on a rolling basis over that 30-day That would include both the Southern District of New York wiretaps and associated materials and the Northern District of New York wiretaps and associated materials; the prison calls and emails from the federal and state facilities; the materials related to the undercover purchases, which includes the audio and video where it was available; the pole camera footage, and I'll come back to that in just a minute, but the pole camera footage; the Facebook search warrants, the returns, the associated orders and applications; and the individual discovery including the raps, pedigrees, any statements, photographs. We propose to have that completed within the first 30-day period.

And then we propose for there to be a second phase or a second 30-day period. In that second 30-day period, we would

produce the search warrants and associated materials from the December 9 arrests and executions of the search warrant. That would include the application, the items seized, any video or photo that was taken in connection with either the arrests or the execution of the search warrants. The reason that we propose this to be part of the second phase is some of that material hasn't been generated yet, like lab reports with respect to the drugs that were seized.

THE COURT: I take it the affidavits and applications could be produced quickly. It's the returns; it's the byproduct of the search that's more problematic.

MR. McDONALD: That's correct, your Honor. I probably should have included part of this in Phase 1. I expect we will be able to produce the search warrants and the affidavits.

THE COURT: Why don't we move that to Phase 1 if it's preexisting.

MR. McDONALD: Of course.

The second category of material that we would include in Phase 2 are the NYPD complaint reports, arrest reports, and associated discoverable materials that I had mentioned previously with respect to the incidents of violence and other illegal conduct that's alleged in the indictment. The reason that we would put that in the second category is with respect to those we have — we have almost all of it. We're still working to make sure that we have the complete universe of

documents.

THE COURT: Can I ask you as to that material, is that old-fashioned hard copy or is it kept electronically?

MR. McDONALD: It's old-fashioned hard copy, your Honor, but we've scanned it and we have it in electronic format. And a lot of that material needs to be redacted and because of the volume of that material, it's going to take us just a little bit of time to complete the redaction process. The reason we want 60 days for that is because we know that that redaction process can take some time.

And then, finally, the individual discovery that includes the sealed arrests from each defendant, same issue with respect to redactions. There are a number of victims who are included on that paperwork. There are a number of other sensitive information that we would need to redact. And like I said, we have all of that information. It's subject to an unsealing order, but it's voluminous. It will take us a little while to go through it to redact it.

Finally, any new discovery that's generated after this date. As I mentioned earlier, this investigation is ongoing.

And, in particular, it's ongoing with respect to both the

May 29, 2011 murder of Johnny Moore and with respect to other

murders and attempted murders.

THE COURT: So as to new discovery, you've already identified a few categories. One is that there are, for

example, cell phones that you've received but not yet got warrants to or in any event searched. Another is that the investigation is ongoing; you may learn about other incidents and that may occasion such things as looking at new state court files and the like.

MR. McDONALD: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Is it really the case that there were no postarrest statements from any of the people arrested this week?

MR. McDONALD: Your Honor, there were no postarrest statements made during debriefings that we're aware of. We are not yet aware with respect to each of the defendants whether there were any spontaneous statements or any statements made to law enforcement that we're in a position to represent to the Court now during the course of the arrests. There were dozens of arrests on Wednesday, and we just haven't had the time to debrief each of the officers.

THE COURT: You may yet learn of them, but you don't know now.

MR. McDONALD: I don't want to represent that there were none, but there are none we're prepared to represent to the Court.

THE COURT: Help me with the mechanics of this. In the previous case I've alluded to a few times, a discovery coordinator was appointed who functioned as something of a

clearinghouse and, in effect, a common database was used. Have you given thought to the mechanics of making this vast amount of material available to a couple dozen defense counsel?

MR. McDONALD: Yes, your Honor, and we have a proposal on that as well. I believe this tracks what was done in the Trinitarios case, that there would be hard drives provided to the government that would be paid for by the CJA office. We would then load it with discovery. We would give the hard drives back to defense counsel, and we would make those hard drives available at the jails.

We're still working out the specifics as to how that material would be made available at the jail at the different facilities. But what had been done in the past and what I expect we'll be able to arrange here would be to have that material available for the defendants in the library and they could view it even outside the ordinary library time periods. Again, we're still working on that. It depends on how many defendants ultimately end up at each different facility.

THE COURT: With a hiccup here and there, there was I thought actually a very good functioning system in the Trinitarios case. I'm more interested in issues relating to, for example, the scale presented by the Title IIIs. If memory serves, those weren't I think provided entirely on individual hard drives so much as there was a common database to which counsel had access.

MR. McDONALD: So the two things that would not go on the hard drive are the Title III and the pole camera footage.

And with respect to both of those, we would propose using a CJA discovery coordinator. And we would either have a central database for the Title III material, or we would simply provide it to the CJA discovery coordinator.

THE COURT: How do you go about getting that? I'm all in favor of that. It seemed to work well last time, and it was useful to have one person who owned that process. How quickly can you get that up and running?

MR. McDONALD: I'm not sure exactly how quickly we can get it up and running, but we'll work as quickly as we possibly can.

THE COURT: I see here Ms. Heller; you obviously have a good resource for working through that. But I encourage you to prioritize it because it worked very well last time and I think the sooner you can get that architecture set up, the better.

MR. McDONALD: Yes, your Honor. We've been working on it. We'll continue to work on it as soon as we leave the court today.

THE COURT: Anything further you want to bring to my attention with respect to Rule 16 discovery?

MR. McDONALD: Nothing with respect to Rule 16.

THE COURT: Were you about to say something?

MR. McDONALD: Go ahead.

THE COURT: The next topic I had and I think you've largely but perhaps not completely covered this is usually in criminal cases, I try to spot at the initial conference the outer range of law enforcement activity that by its nature tends to produce occasionally, anyway, suppression motions: searches, seizures, postarrest statements, identification procedures. More often than not, it's warrantless searches and seizures that generate motion practice.

Is there anything you can tell me now that can give me a shape of the whole or give individual defendants a little more color as to what's out there?

MR. McDONALD: Your Honor, I think we've largely covered it in our discussion about the Rule 16 material. The Title III wiretaps, the searches and seizures that we had discussed and evidence of that sort.

My colleague reminds me that the police files for those incidents will make evident the Fourth Amendment events. For each of the particular incidents there are a variety of Fourth Amendment events. Many of them — for example, one of the defendants is stopped. He's stopped because there's video surveillance that shows the defendants committing a shooting. After having viewed the video surveillance, the officer stops the defendant having recognized him from the video and recognized him in the vicinity of the Patterson Houses area or

in the vicinity of where the shooting occurred, stops him, frisks him, and finds a gun. There are a number of incidents like that. I don't want to go through each one of them.

But in terms of the categories, I think there are the Title III intercepts, the searches and seizures conducted pursuant to warrants, and then the searches and seizures conducted without a warrant but pursuant to some other valid basis.

THE COURT: So in smaller criminal cases, I tend to use the second conference as the deadline for defense counsel to indicate if they want to make a suppression motion. From everything you told me, that's completely unrealistic here because defense counsel will need to, among other things, burrow through the state court incident files, if you will, to determine whether, for example, there might be a search or seizure that they would want to challenge.

Am I reading that right?

MR. McDONALD: I think that's correct, your Honor. The only thing that I'd say is that from the government's perspective, that discovery is voluminous. But from each particular individual defendant's perspective --

THE COURT: There's the matter of finding Waldo, right. The problem is you've got so much material here that it may not be realistic on the discovery schedule to throw the burden on any counsel by 60 days from now or two and a half

months from now to even know the range of potential Fourth

Amendment activity to which they may have standing to

challenge.

MR. McDONALD: Sure.

THE COURT: All right. That's extremely helpful. Let me just pause and compliment you for a very well organized, helpful presentation. Obviously, helpful to me, but I'm sure it's extremely helpful to defense counsel, as well, just to get a shape of what lies ahead.

With that in mind, before I call on the defense, it had been my intention to schedule a next conference probably in the first week of March or so, anticipating something like this. Does the government have a view about that?

MR. McDONALD: I believe before your Honor took the bench, we had discussed the possibility of March 2. That would work for the government.

THE COURT: Not just a matter of your availability, but does that sound like a realistic time to next check in given the range of discovery that's about to be made available?

MR. McDONALD: I think it does, your Honor. The first 30-day phase would end January 11. The second 30-day phase would end I believe on February 10. That would be about a month after that second 30-day phase. To the extent there are any issues the parties would need to bring before the Court, I think that would give us about a month to work on resolving

them before we brought them to the Court.

Your Honor is correct that it may not be that defense counsel is aware of all of the Fourth Amendment issues that defense counsel may want to bring to your attention, but I think they would be aware of the major ones at that point to the extent there are any.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.

Let me turn now to the defense. Again, focusing on macro issues, not defendant specific issues, anything anyone wants to bring to my attention or raise at this point? I realize this all landed on you in the last 48 hours, but we have estimable and multiple defense counsel here. Any views?

Mr. Siegel, I'll ask everyone to use the microphone near Mr. London just so we can all hear.

MR. SIEGEL: I have a microphone here. Jesse Siegel for Wilfredo Rivera.

Just listening to the volume of discovery, happy to come back in March, but it doesn't really seem like we're going to do anything more at that point or be able to do anything more than just hear from the government whether more discovery is coming our way. It's hard to imagine we're going to really have a handle in any meaningful way on this volume of discovery at that time. So if that's what the Court thinks is useful, happy to do it, but I don't think it's realistic to expect more than that.

THE COURT: Well, I think it's not realistic to impose on the defense at that point an obligation to come forward and commit to suppression hearings; that certainly I agree with you on. But I'm quite reluctant to defer a next conference until much after that because you all may be discovering things about the case that you urgently want to bring to my attention or there may be some scheduling things we can do to get out of the way. It also is, frankly, a useful way for me to check in to make sure that all the discovery protocols here are working.

Veterans of the last case will know, will report to all of you, and there are several among the defense group here, that there were occasional hiccups with respect to defendant access to discovery at the MDC or MCC. And it was useful, frankly, as an enforcement device to have a conference here before me. It made sure that everyone ventilated those issues. It made sure that meaningful access was in fact being provided.

So it seems to me that while I may have been more ambitious in my thinking behind yesterday's order about what might be able to be accomplished at the next conference, it's important for us all to gather.

MR. SIEGEL: I agree, just to touch base about that. It's also my experience when I hear 30 days and 60 days, I'm thinking 45 days and 75 days because there are these hiccups which are inevitable.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you, Mr. Siegel.

Any other views? Mr. DiChiara, just use the microphone.

MR. DiCHIARA: Gerald DiChiara, your Honor. I would ask if the Court would authorize for CJA a transcript of today's proceedings.

THE COURT: Authorized.

And, in fact, Mr. McDonald, I was going to say to you the following. Inasmuch as you're going to be having other defendants brought into the case, your presentation here was exceptionally helpful. I'm not going to make you give it at each individual conference. So please make that transcript available to counsel as they come into the case for other defendants so that when we have an initial conference, I can incorporate that by reference.

MR. McDONALD: Of course, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Anyone else on the defense side?

MR. TULMAN: Good morning, your Honor. Scott Tulman for Kaye Rosado. I apologize, your Honor, I was tardy.

Mr. Dunn, Tom Dunn, initially stood up for me and he left and I had been here for some time at that point.

THE COURT: You notified my chambers you were running late and I appreciate it.

MR. TULMAN: Your Honor, just one consideration and that is with respect to the hard drives. And I know that this

is, particularly given the number of defendants and given the lack of resources with the hard drive, if there's some way to somehow figure out how to get these on discs because I know that at the MCC, there are at the individual floors the inmates are able to view it on discs.

THE COURT: You're making a point as to access for the defendants as opposed to counsel.

MR. TULMAN: Yes, I'm addressing the issue of access of the defendants, because a lot of times, of course, it's the defendants who know best the discovery that they need to review and so it's just a consideration about making up discs as well.

THE COURT: All right. At this point, we're enough under the hood that it's not productive for me to resolve it.

I'll just say this, Mr. McDonald. I don't know that any of us can foresee the technology that's going to be necessary. Mr. Tulman makes a good point that it may be that some other mechanical way of making it usefully available is better. I know you'll be sensitive to that. And when we have discovery counsel in place, coordinator in place, that person will own this as well. But I trust you'll be receptive to concerns like that.

MR. McDONALD: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Anyone else?

Let me just confirm what I think is obvious. I take it no defense counsel is seeking a trial date at this point?

MR. SIEGEL: No, your Honor. 1 2 MS. CARVLIN: No, your Honor. THE COURT: The record will reflect a chorus of no's. 3 All right. Given that, is there any reason I 4 5 shouldn't set as our next conference March 2 at 9:30? 6 MR. McDONALD: Works for the government, your Honor. 7 THE COURT: I'm going to set the next conference for March 2 at 9:30. 8 9 I expect at that conference, among other things, the 10 following will happen. I will want a detailed report from the government on the status of discovery. Certainly, my hope is 11 that you'll be able to comply with the schedule that you've set 12 13 out as to the production of discovery, but I also expect that 14 there will be inevitably some more discovery and I'll want a 15 report of the same nature that you gave today as to that. I'm also going to be very interested in mechanical 16 17 issues regarding access to discovery. I expect government 18 counsel and defense counsel will be in close coordination with what I expect will be a soon to be appointed discovery 19 20 coordinator so I can learn about any issues. It goes without saying that if any hiccups arise, any issues that any counsel 21 22 is aware of, if you can't resolve it yourself, make an 23 application to me. Sometimes my intervention can help get the

Government, I will want at that next conference to

24

25

relevant party's attention.

understand where we're headed here. I think it's important for the defense to have the two and a half months to begin to make sense of the discovery material.

And, defense, I expect you, notwithstanding that I'm not going to be requiring you to announce suppression motions at the next conference, I expect you to be working hard to get through this material so that you have a sense of the direction of the case from your perspective.

Government, I'll ask you with all the things you've got going to prioritize communicating to individual defense counsel where to look to the best of your knowledge in the discovery material for the matters most relevant to each client. Putting myself in the shoes of defense counsel, it's very hard to know where to look in the Rule 16 material. So I encourage you to be proactive in alerting defense counsel, understanding that your knowledge is bounded by what you know at any particular time, what the particular incidents are, what the calls are that you think would be most productive for them to look at. The sooner we can arrive at some greater parity of information, the sooner the log jam begins to break.

MR. McDONALD: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Defense, I would like to ask that somebody step up within the defense group to be a de facto coordinator. I'm not, to be clear, asking that you form a joint defense group; and I'm not asking, to be clear, that

somebody be the head of it. I want one person who can play round up here, who can, if I issue an order with respect to dates, I don't want to have to get 15 letters. I'd like somebody to be corralling the troops just for logistical purposes.

MR. LONDON: I nominate Jesse Siegel.

THE COURT: Mr. Siegel, are you going to give a Sherman-like denial here?

MR. SIEGEL: If drafted, I will serve, Judge.

THE COURT: You're drafted.

To be clear, Mr. Siegel is not here to clean the Augean stables. He's here simply because he's graciously as a respected veteran of the panel and these cases to communicate among you. Please get Mr. Siegel your contact, in particular email information, so that a defense group can arise promptly.

Mr. Siegel, thank you.

MR. SIEGEL: Thank you, Judge.

THE COURT: Is there an application for the exclusion of time between now and March 2?

MR. McDONALD: There is, your Honor. The government moves to exclude time under the Speedy Trial Act so that the defense counsel and the defendants can begin reviewing discovery and so that the parties can discuss possible resolutions of the case short of trial.

THE COURT: Okay. Any objection to the exclusion of

time?

MS. CARVLIN: No, Judge.

THE COURT: I'll exclude the time between now and March 2 pursuant to Title 18, United States Code, Section 3161(h)(7)(A). For avoidance of doubt, that time runs as to all defendants in the case, not merely the ones who are present. I am doing so because there is an overwhelmingly good reason to think that the interests of justice support the exclusion of time and outweigh the interests of the public and the defendants in a speedy trial.

Most obviously, there is a veritable dump truck of Rule 16 material that is going to be served upon or made available to defense counsel, who have a lot of work ahead of them. And I want to make sure the defense counsel has plenty of time to begin to make sense of this multidimensional, complicated, important case.

In addition, I'm mindful that defense counsel have only gotten to know their clients with perhaps one or two exceptions in the last 48 hours. So the time excluded is also intended to allow defense counsel to connect with their clients and begin to understand the situation presented by each of their individual situations and to begin to make appropriate investigation.

Government, I'm going to ask you to submit a letter three work days before the next conference giving me a report

on all things relating to the case. I'll ask you to confer with the defense beforehand. The goal here is as follows.

When I've got 25 defendants and defense counsel in a room, it's hard to be very nimble in resolving things. And so to the extent there are issues or things productively brought to my attention beforehand, I can reflect on that and be better prepared before the next conference.

So three work days before the next conference, I'd like a status report from the government informed by your discussions with the defense such that if, for example, there are practical issues vis-a-vis discovery that you're becoming aware of, your letter should reflect your knowledge based on your conversations with defense counsel.

All right?

MR. McDONALD: Yes, your Honor.

The final thing from the government, I know the Court will be aware of this, but I believe in order for us to actually proceed with the discovery coordinator, the Court needs to appoint the discovery coordinator.

THE COURT: Very good. Just get me an order. I'll be glad to appoint one. I believe it was Emma Greenwood who was discovery coordinator last time. I don't know that one person should do this twice in a lifetime, but if she's willing, she was great.

Anything further from the government?

MR. McDONALD: Nothing further, your Honor. THE COURT: Anything from any defense counsel? MS. CARVLIN: No, your Honor. THE COURT: Thank you. I wish you all well. We will resume in 15 minutes to complete the hearing on the bail appeal with respect to defendants Dentico and Brown. We'll do that here. Thank you.